

## **SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SOLID WASTE ACTIVITIES**

**March 13, 2007**

**Immediately Following Cmte. on Administration**

Chairman Roy called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Roy, Lopez, Osborne, Forest  
Alderman Smith

Absent: Alderman O'Neil

Messrs.: Joanne McLaughlin, Patrick Corcoran

Chairman Roy and Chairman of the Board Lopez called for a moment of silence in memory of former School Board Member Carol Scott who passed away today.

Chairman Roy addressed item 3 of the agenda:

3. Communication from Joanne McLaughlin, Recycling Superintendent, submitting recommendations for changes to two of its Solid Waste Programs as follows:
  - a) Bulky Pick-up Program

Ms. Joanne McLaughlin, Recycling Superintendent, stated tonight we're coming to the Solid Waste Committee in response to your direction at the December meeting that we come back with formal proposals for the Bulky Pick-up Program as well as the CRT Electronics Program. It's come to my attention that there might be a little bit of misunderstanding regarding the Bulky Program in terms of what that is. Let me tell you that the appliances are not considered part of the Bulky Program. They have in the past always been charged for and the Highway Department would continue to charge for that. So, that is something separate from the Bulky Program. If you'd like to go to your handouts what we've done is we've developed some wordage for the refuse regulations for some enhancement to those to address the Bulky Program. As you know currently the program provides for unlimited curbside collection of curbside collection of bulky materials. Based on

recommendations from the Solid Waste Focus Group back in September of 2004 as well as your Special Committee on Solid Waste and Recycling the Highway Department is proposing the following: the Bulky Pick-up Program will be restricted to two free pickups per building, per calendar year and each pick-up may include up to five individual items. Once those two free pick-ups are used there will be additional charges for any other materials that we have gotten requests for pick-up. The change to our Solid Waste Regulations are as follows: we would include the bulky material collection will be restricted to two free pick-ups per property address per calendar year. Each pick-up may contain up to five items. Properties requiring additional pick-ups in any given calendar year will be charged for those services and I've also included a bulky fee structure to give you an idea on what those costs would look like. What I've done is I've looked at the Bulky Programs in a number of other municipalities and this is what we have come up with.

Alderman Osborne moved for discussion. Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Osborne stated I have a few concerns here. Number one, we still have one driver and one cherry picker.

Ms. McLaughlin stated correct.

Alderman Osborne stated this particular program...who is going to police this type of...each household, how many they put out, how many pick-ups they've had?

Ms. McLaughlin stated we'll be developing a spreadsheet and we'll have that information. When the foreman over at the drop-off facility receives a call that will be entered into a spreadsheet. It will be sortable on the address so we'll know who has had how many pick-ups in any given calendar year.

Alderman Osborne stated so this fellow would be the one taking care of all of this.

Ms. McLaughlin stated he does currently take all the calls anyway, it will just be a matter of instead of entering it on a piece of paper he'll enter it on his computer in a spreadsheet.

Alderman Osborne stated in my ward I have a lot of it, I have my share anyway. Right now, we can't even take care of what we've got it seems like as far as tires...that's a big thing there...they're all over the place and we have to pick them up anyway regardless if they're on somebody else's property or in the alleys in front of somebody else's dumpster because if we don't then they'll be there

forever anyway. So, what I'm thinking about here is it's pretty hard to take care of what we have if we go ahead with something like this and only have two pick-ups per household I guess you're not going by 3-families or more you're going by single-family homes...whatever.

Ms. McLaughlin stated one building right it would still be two pick-ups per year.

Alderman Osborne stated we all know that single-family dwellings we have no problem with them anyway because I have one and I know I don't put out that kind of thing anyway.

Ms. McLaughlin stated that's the intent of the program.

Alderman Osborne stated okay so what I'm trying to say here is what we're trying to do is we're trying to penalize multi-families...the landlords of multi-families, true.

Ms. McLaughlin stated they're a commercial business and what we are doing now is we're supporting the material that they're disposing of. As a business one would expect that that would be a line item.

Alderman Osborne stated okay I just had these questions in the back of my mind. A single-family dwelling pays "X" amount of dollars. A 20-family dwelling pays probably what 15 times what they pay. So, everybody's paying taxes out there. What I'm scared of is blight. I'm scared of what's going to happen here once we get into this type of a program...these multi-families are going to be throwing that trash out and it's going to come out the windows. So, they really don't care...the tenants don't care in some cases where that trash goes once they're moving. So, once they're moving and all this trash is out there in different areas of the City that I'm talking about now not where it supposed to be. This is what I'm scared of... illegal dumping.

Chairman Roy stated if I could, Alderman, one of the comments that I think Joanne was thinking of making but hasn't yet...when that driver in that truck picks everything up we still pay to get rid of it and that's at \$64/ton I believe, Joanne... Patrick's saying higher...what are we at now...\$65 and change. So, this is a way of controlling it, monitoring it. If someone throws it out on the curb and it is considered blight the policy would still be there to go get it and get it off of the street...now, there's just an avenue for enforcement and control which will hopefully settle out some of our blight problems versus just us saying throw it out we'll take it...whether you do it five days-a-week or ten days-a-year can be a considerable impact on a neighborhood as Alderman Smith knows. As we look

towards doing this it's a measure of control and potential revenue to offset the costs that the single-families have been subsidizing for many, many years. So, we are paying to get rid of this is the point that I'm making...there is a cost to the City and with that I'll go to other questions or follow-up, Alderman Osborne.

Alderman Osborne stated I'd just like to address what you said here. You're saying that the single-family dwellings which I am are paying for all of the multi-family pick-ups is that what you're saying.

Chairman Roy stated we're offsetting the cost yes.

Alderman Osborne asked how do you figure that?

Chairman Roy replied it's a service that's equally divided by all properties in the City that you as a single-family person is not using.

Alderman Osborne stated again what I said before was a multi-family dwelling is paying a lot of taxes and that's the reason why I'm saying that. I don't know how you can that the single-family dwellings which I have...I don't like paying for somebody else either but I just can't comprehend the situation here. I'm scared of blight. I think if we go ahead and do something like this we're going to have a lot more on our hands than we have now...this is what I'm trying to say. I have nothing against the idea but I don't think...in my ward anyway...this is fine probably up in Ward 2 or 1 where you don't have a lot of multi-families up there so you don't even have to worry. What I have to worry about is I get calls everyday with garbage all over the place. I can imagine what's going to happen now.

Chairman Roy stated the point of this and I'm not going to steal too much of Joanne's thunder or speak from the Chair too much if there is no control, if there's no ordinance and no policy it will remain blighted. If there is an effort to make landlords know that when a tenant moves out and they dump everything on the street instead of it being the City's problem it becomes the landlord's problem then you'll have landlord's being more responsible and that's the goal of this is to keep tract of it, create responsibility and clean it up.

Alderman Osborne asked don't we have ordinances now if they're doing something...don't we have fines in place or anything now for that. This is probably what we should look into more so than charging everybody after two pick-ups.

Chairman Roy stated the policy at the Highway Department is if it is on this curb they will pick it up and that's where we're trying to find the regulation that works with that.

Alderman Forest stated along that line I don't believe that doing this will create blight. I think what this is going to do is finally address the problem we're having with certain landlords. The majority of the landlords in this City are responsible... they pick-up their stuff, they put it away or they have it picked up and everything else. This addresses landlords that you go there every single week...this is a way to go after them. Right now, we don't. I call...not on my ward...I call on a lot of complaints and Matt has heard some of my phone calls in George Smith's ward (10). George Smith calls every day. Henry Thibault calls every day for the same people...day-in, day-out. This will address these people. Right now, we don't address them we send the Highway Department over, they pick it up, they bring it to the drop-off zone and we as a City whether it's one-family, commercial or whatever subsidize these people and this is a way to go back after them.

Alderman Osborne stated basically if we're talking about just certain landlords I think we should aim at them not everybody...this is what I'm trying to get at.

Alderman Forest interjected if we don't get at them it doesn't get done.

Alderman Osborne stated I'm saying if we can put some ordinances together here for something like that rather than trying to go at a magnitude here of everybody maybe even some single-family homes put out a couple times a year more than that or more than five articles at a time so why should they have to pay with this list that we have here of all these items that you have to pay...bookcases \$5.00, cabinets \$15.00, desks \$10.00...this is enough to make you go crazy. I think we should look at the problem here not take everything into consideration and put everybody into the problem.

Chairman Roy stated but it is everybody's problem, Alderman, because if there's no line someone pays for it and right now that's divided by all 37,000 homes throughout the City. So, if someone puts out five items once per year they're exempt. If they do it again they're still exempt. When they exceed that and it becomes more than the norm as established by the Highway Department then it becomes across the board policy like speed limits. You can't say to one person that abuses it you've got to go slower than the one that doesn't abuse it. It has to be the same policy across the board for all 37,000 homes. This allows a number of stops free and then when you break the norm you become paying for it instead of it becoming subsidized by the people that don't break the norm.

Alderman Osborne stated, Mr. Chairman, you're pushing all the costs onto the tenants too in some cases here because these landlords that you're talking about they're going to have to start paying more money like when they go up in taxes then they put it into the tenants problems. There are all kinds of ways of looking at this. I'm telling you that these multi-families pay a big money from what I see on the tax rolls. So, we can't really penalize everybody for the mistakes of a few. If we're going to do that we should have ordinances in place, penalties in place, fines in place, put some teeth into it and that's the way we should go...not this way...that's my feelings.

Alderman Forest stated if this is where we're going with this, Alderman...you're asking this Committee and I've heard you make comments to the full Board about solving the problems...we as a Board and we as a group have been dealing with this for three or four years at your request and other Aldermen and then you're turning around and debating us as to whether we're fair or not. I think this is fair.

Chairman Roy stated Gentlemen, I will ask you to address the Chair and keep this civil. Alderman Smith has been waiting for comments and we'll got to him.

Alderman Smith stated thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We provide a service to the City and I think one of the services is this pick-up. I'll tell you what...the Neighborhood Enhancement Team (NET) has been doing a good job over on Granite Street, I think that this is a service. These people pay the taxes...this is a service...it will be a second cousin to the proposal of Bad & Tag, which I'm definitely against myself. I think that there would be more litter this way than in any other possible way. Right now, we have some direction, we're working very well with the different department like Zoning and Building and I think Alderman Osborne hit it right on the head...a 3-tenant house probably costs in revaluation \$350,000-\$400,000. Well, they should get some service to the \$100,000-\$125,000 and what happens...God forbid...I've lived in the neighborhood...on Cedar, Spruce and such in the backstreets you'll have everything out there in the backstreets and it will be a fire hazard and who's going to pick it up...you're going to say to Highway pick it up. You're going to have litter all over the place and I'd just like to say one last thing is the NET Team I think you should talk to them personally. I think you should talk probably to the Mayor...we've been trying to clean up the neighborhoods and this is not going to clean up the neighborhoods. It's just like getting another tax for revenue and these people pay taxes for services...let's give them the service that they want.

Chairman Roy stated Alderman Smith I appreciate your comments but much like the viewpoint of taxation this is allowing those who do not abuse the system a free service twice-per-year and I think if we poll this Committee and yourself and other

residents of Manchester that are sitting in this room we'd find that very few people do it more than twice-a-year and as far as the cluttering of the alleys that's exactly what we would have if we didn't do this. We have a situation where in many alleys people empty the apartments with no cost to the landlord or tenant into the alley and Highway picks it up. That would be the same if this was passed that they would put litter there...a call comes in, Highway goes out, it gets taken care of. This would just let us control and regulate the problem and that's why the fee structure was set as low as it was in comparison to what we pay per ton. So, I would look for this to move forward simply on the fact that the experts, people in waste management have all said this is the way to start controlling some of the problems that we have and just bringing that forward.

Alderman Lopez stated looking at this I don't know how you came up with the list.

Alderman Forest interjected three years of meetings, Alderman.

Alderman Lopez stated I know we've talked about it and talked about it and I think some good points have been brought up but as it is a drastic change...all these items that are listed here...is the Highway Department picking up anything that's listed here now or does a scavenger truck go out and do all of this.

Ms. McLaughlin stated very few of these things do the packer trucks actually pick up...that's why this list are those items that don't fit in the packer trucks. We went over this with the solid waste department...these are the things that would need to be picked up with the cherry picker, the crane truck and the way this was developed was by looking at other towns to see what they do.

Alderman Lopez stated looking at this if I see some of these 3-tenements that were brought up it's possible to cost that tenant \$50 or \$60 if somebody moved out of the apartment and they threw it out there. I guess my question would be if it was out there in front of a 6-tenement or 10-tenement who pays for it. The Aldermen are still going to have to get the Highway Department to come over and pick it up. How do you enforce it?

Ms. McLaughlin replied we'd have to have ordinances probably.

Alderman Lopez stated the point I'm making is if you come out in the morning in front of a 6-tenement house and you have dressers, beds, etc. somebody's going to say I don't know where it came from, you didn't see me throw it out there, so you're going to have to call the scavenger truck to come and pick it up. So, the Alderman is going to call and say pick it up because we can't identify who did it.

I go back to Alderman Smith's point...we've got a service we're providing, we're going to have to do the same thing...who's going to go there and say okay this is a couch, this is crib...who's going to do all that?

Chairman Roy stated they do it now...the driver does have some responsibility of what he puts in the truck. The difference being that if you pull up to my house, for example, and there is a couch and a sofa and loveseat that's just dumped out front and I receive a bill or a knock on the door that says that's \$35.00 to have that picked up on the third visit and I think that's what's getting lost...that's on the third visit to a property. So, you've already had two chances of putting 10 objects out for free disposal on the third visit it then has to be realized what is being picked up and who get billed. Landlords can have someone move out, leave an entire apartment full, empty it onto the street, not pay any disposal and on the third time of doing that per year the City comes with no charge, picks it up, hauls it away and the landlord can keep the entire security deposit for their own pockets and say we had to empty the apartment. Even if there was no charge to that tenant when they charge that landlord for getting rid of the debris left by the tenant and that's where we're drawing the line between the 6-families and the 10-families and the 20-families and what is the norm for the system...two free visits...that means if someone gets visited...10 objects scott free. When the abuses happen that's when they get charged.

Alderman Lopez stated I understand all that I'm just at a point where enforcing all of this is one thing and the second thing I think when we asked for this if I recollect...I'm not positive but at least I was interested into what it was costing us now...do we have a breakdown of costs that we're going to save if we went by this?

Ms. McLaughlin replied I think I figured it out a few years ago and it was up around \$500,000.

Alderman Lopez stated \$500,000 we're going to save in a period of what time.

Ms. McLaughlin stated year.

Alderman Lopez stated \$500,000 a year it's costing us to do this now.

Ms. McLaughlin stated yes, Sir. If you consider the time, the travel, the fuel, the disposal fees demands time yes and we also know that about 80% of the calls that we get come from the apartment buildings, large apartment buildings and we hear from the same landlords two and three times a week to pick up rooms full of furniture.



Chairman Roy stated if I could interject, Alderman, the entire top box for those at home that don't have this...the bulky items non-metal if you add up that entire apartment or home's worth of material it comes to \$147.00 you would pay more for people to carry it to the curb at \$6.00 or \$7.00 per hour than you would pay the City for this service on the third visit. So, for us to be looking at this as a massive expense if someone were to load a truck and bring this to the drop-off they would pay more in weight dropping this off then we would be asking them to pay for us to empty out an entire home or apartment and that's where the equity comes in and that's why these prices are so reasonable. We don't want to stop people from having the service we just want to find a fair balance so that the abusers are not getting a free ride and those property owners...even many, many landlords that don't abuse the system that pay the dump truck to come, that pay the dump truck to come and haul it to our transfer station and put it in a construction bin there that are doing the right system...they're not receiving any benefit. What we'd like to do now is take that \$500,000 per fiscal year and give it back to them as a benefit...that's where now in saving \$500,000 you take the \$40,000 that we can't seem to find and hire a Solid Waste Compliance Officer that has sat on the table now for three years. You hire the extra zoning official, you have the extra regulatory people that go out and patrol and control this. So, if you take 10% or 20% of the revenue savings and roll back into regulation your blight diminishes considerably. Me two cents...thank you, Gentlemen.

Alderman Osborne stated Joanne we have one driver, we have one cherry picker... what you're trying to say...what you two were just explaining to each other \$500,000. So, this guy goes out and he's doing \$500,000 worth of work is what you're trying to say, right?

Chairman Roy stated no cost.

Alderman Osborne stated cost or whatever...it's costing the City but this guy's doing it all...one man, one truck. So, by erasing this or charging people whatever where is it going to bring us. We're going to have to hire somebody else, do more and so on and so forth. This is not figured out at all it's just put together, charge so much.

Chairman Roy interjected Sir I will disagree with you. We have spent four years working on this...the Special Committee on Solid Waste, CLD consultant, Pinard Waste Management have consulted on this...Alderman Forest started this when I was a freshman Alderman but the \$500,000 is cost that's not something that will just go away if we interact with this.

Alderman Osborne interjected you just said you wanted to give the \$500,000 back to the people how can you do that if it isn't going away?

Chairman Roy stated the cost to the City is here with no revenue...that material is costing the taxpayer every day and I'll yield back to Alderman Lopez who I did cut off before.

Alderman Lopez stated I just wanted to find out is there a document with your numbers...your \$500,000 and what it's costing us and what the potential is and what revenues are going to come in so we can look at that?

Ms. McLaughlin replied no I did not do that.

Alderman Lopez stated I thought you said you had that.

Ms. McLaughlin stated I figured out a few years ago what it was that we were spending.

Alderman Lopez stated I think that's important too. It is a major decision. Departure for us and I'm not arguing the point whether we should right now or shouldn't. I just don't have all of the information. If it's costing us \$500,000 we're going to make \$500,000 that's one thing. If it's going to cause disruption throughout the City and it's going to cost us more to send a scavenger truck out there people are just going to throw it on people's property like when the people come in from out-of-town sometimes at Southwest Little League they come in and throw their garbage in the dumpster...people do that all the time. So, I just want to make sure that maybe what should be done here is go into...we're missing one person on the Committee here right.

Chairman Roy stated yes Alderman O'Neil.

Alderman Lopez asked has there been a public meeting in reference to this?

Alderman Forest stated could I just answer that and make a suggestion. Unfortunately, we have three Aldermen here out of the 14...Joanne, it's a suggestion that I want to make. Do you have the original material that was given to us that we all voted on a few years ago. I would suggest that if you have it make copies of it for the three Aldermen on the Committee here that lead us to this point that they I believe voted for originally when all of this started. I would suggest the three Aldermen get a copy of this material so they could reread it so

that we wouldn't be arguing here as to what we said we would do and what we said we wouldn't do because I think all of that material led us to this point today and I will be done for the night as far as comments.

Alderman Lopez stated I want to say that I know Armand Forest worked on this really hard and I commend him on that. I don't throw refrigerators out every year...a 6-tenement or 12-tenement might throw out a couch, the kitchen sink out there and if I had a bicycle that I wanted to throw away I would probably pay \$2.00 to do it. But, I think it's just a big change that maybe a presentation to the full Board or like Alderman Forest said give us the information and maybe we need to educate the full Board as to what we're trying to accomplish here. But, again, Alderman Osborne does have a point too...are we still going to send a truck out there, how much savings...\$500,000 become now \$200,000 because we're making \$300,000 revenue...those are the things that I think we need to see and then how does...you play a major part...not yet but you could play a major part and maybe you could be the scavenger and pick it up who knows...do they do that in the other communities. Could you explain how it works.

Mr. Patrick Corcoran, President and Owner of Corcoran Environmental Services, stated I've been in the business for 14 years and the City about a year ago signed a recycling and yard waste contract with my firm. We're also building a plant for the City's materials recovery recyclables material. So, the question is our firm manages curbside collection contracts for bulky debris...material that you folks are trying to manage right now with your truck and your individual that works here in the City. There's two great points here...first of all you need to cover costs and that's not happening but you don't want to have material all over the street...are valid points. But, we charge whether it be dropped off at a transfer station that we're managing or when we pick it up at your household...we're charging and it's not as favorable of a number as you folks are offering your City residents. Our cost is twice to 2.5 times more expensive and I'll tell you why because that driver and that truck aren't cheap and with fuel going to \$3.00/gallon soon we'll be lucky if we break even. So, quite honestly your fee structure is very, very nice for your residents here in Manchester.

Alderman Lopez asked is this something that...at what point would we say okay can you do this...we're not going to pick up anything...have you looked at your long-range contract as to whether you would pick it up instead of the City...we'll even give you the truck? If you're doing it at other places when would you do it here?

Chairman Roy interjected could I answer that, Patrick. And, I'll throw this out to you Alderman...the privatization of sections of our Highway Department are a much larger discussion than bulky waste pick up. Our long-term goal in discussions with Frank Thomas and Kevin Sheppard and Joanne and Patrick and his company are to make the solid waste pick-ups and services the most efficient, the most cost-effective for the constituent. Right now, we're talking about what do we pay Waste Management...I believe the last number was almost \$9 million a year for picking up all of our.

Ms. McLaughlin interjected they're not doing our recycling or yard waste anymore so I think it's about \$4 million.

Mr. Corcoran stated \$4.3.

Chairman Roy stated \$4.3 million so this is a very significant cost. I will because the report was brought up by Alderman Forest...on November 16, 2004 approved by the full Board under short-term implementation...side note no wonder everyone thinks things move slowly in government...on November 16, 2004 under short-term implementation:

- Restrict bulky waste collection to two free pick ups per property, per year;

As I look through this report that's been sitting on my computer for a couple of years it amazes me that we haven't moved to the point where we're finding equity within our budget and our solid waste. This is a major, major cost per year to the City and that cost is spread out over every taxpayer.

Alderman Lopez asked could you read that for the public of what we said and what is being done.

Chairman Roy stated the two items passed that evening were the immediate recommendations (5 items) and the short-term implementation (7 items).

Immediate implementation:

- continue residential solid waste curbside collection and transportation by Waste Management (on-going);
- exercise 1 last year for recycling with Waste Management...now expired and we've entered into a contract with Corcoran Environmental;
- develop an RFP for recycling and yard waste that's been implemented and under execution right now;

- augment Saturday drop off hours...that was limited due to manpower and stayed the show;
- lastly, total use for small commercial businesses and non-profits...limited two totes provided they recycle (implemented).

Short-term implementation:

- develop a customer database...being done and in process with our recycling;
- mandatory use of tote in downtown tote collection zone (implemented)...no...fully or not fully. It was my understanding that every alley had totes and no more garbage cans.

Ms. McLaughlin stated we still see some businesses that don't have sufficient number of totes and of course all of the recyclable material which is about 80% of what is in those alleys is still going to trash.

Chairman Roy stated but the mandatory use of totes has been taken care of...the next one is

- cardboard recycling in downtown..., which I believe, is still waiting for implementation.

Ms. McLaughlin stated that is right.

Chairman Roy stated as far as garbage cans in downtown those are no longer. The last is...

- restrict bulky waste collections to two free pick ups per property, per year;
- creative enforcement positions utilizing fees from modified bulky programs and/or solid waste user fees;
- include free resident yard waste disposal or drop off which I believe was a move we're working on with the recycling center when that opens; and
- move to weekly single stream recycling program with collection on the same day as MSW...right now it's dual stream on the same day and will move to single stream when the plant at Dunbarton Road is open.

Chairman Roy stated we've done some great work that came out of this Committee almost three years ago but we need to finish it off with the equity of everyone in the City and as much as people are worried about blight, in my

opinion, these are great steps to limit that and that's why I look to move this forward.

Ms. McLaughlin stated I think a lot of the discussion here has been more of a policy issue and that certainly is the discussion that the Committee needs to have which I felt had happened and that's why I was coming back with a formal proposal to how to actually institute that.

Chairman Roy stated Alderman Lopez just asked if we could have a public hearing. We did have one three year's ago when this report came out and we heard from very few landlords that had a problem with it impacting their costs and without the opportunity to sit back and say for \$140 you can empty an entire apartment how much of a security deposit are you keeping...is not fair to the public if the person who lives in a single-family home that doesn't use this service isn't going to come out because it's not going to affect them they're not going to realize this will save them a dime on their taxes every year or twenty-five cents on the taxes...this is a large cost item and it's something we can rectify very easily.

Alderman Smith stated I will reiterate services come with a cost and we provide this right now...Fire...anybody want to get rid of the Fire Department, no. Does anybody want to get rid of Police...just hired 10 policemen...\$1 million...this is a service that people demand and this is a service I think is necessary to keep the neighborhoods clean and I would wish the Committee would hold this up and talk to the NET Team, NeighborWorks, Planning, Health and Building.

Chairman Roy stated I appreciate that suggestion but I will remind you that we do have false alarm fees that if property's do have an exorbitant amount of false alarms I believe that number is three per year we do charge them for every false alarm after the third. So, we do have other policies like this that are there.

Alderman Smith stated we're talking about health and safety of the City.

Chairman Roy stated I do agree.

Alderman Forest stated I have a question seeing that the Coordinator of the NET Team is here (Matt Normand)...Matt, how many hours a week are you personally putting in on this NET Team?

Deputy Clerk Normand replied just myself would be probably two hours-a-day that I spend just trying to coordinate and follow-up for information but that's just one person...building's probably putting in far more hours than that...Fire and Police.

Alderman Forest stated so there is a cost for the NET Team. After Alderman Smith makes a comment I'd like to move this question.

Alderman Osborne stated first of all Mr. Corcoran mentioned it would cost three or four times what we're paying now at \$500,000 so I guess we can't go out private with it...I think we've been doing this for quite a while and I'm still saying that I am scared of the blight. I don't like garbage...I've taken it out physically myself with my own two hands out of places so I know all about it. I just think...we passed all the other things you brought up in the past...most of them are implemented the only thing that's hanging right now is this particular bulky waste situation which again Joanne...they have to pay first is that it...in other words if they're going to have more than so many articles or whatever they're going to have to pay the Highway Department first before you go out there and have them pick up the couches or whatever you have out there.

Ms. McLaughlin stated unless an Alderman calls us and tells us to pick it up right away.

Alderman Osborne stated that's what we're doing now but I'm just saying that other than that they're going to have to pay is what I'm trying to say in order for you to go and pick up these items.

Ms. McLaughlin stated or they'll get billed for it.

Alderman Osborne stated once this gets around and all the tenants and landlords before they pay it they're going to find some other place to put it whether it be in the woods on the outskirts or whatever it might be but there's all kinds of little things to this and it's a very scary situation here. Unless this is not picked up properly...if you want to spend three or four times the money and have Mr. Corcoran pick it up no matter where he sees it on the street, no matter where it is he's going to pick it up...that's a different ballgame but here it's still not costing us an awful lot of money...we've been doing it for quite a while and at least the taxpayers are getting something for their dollar whether it might be the few that are abusing it like I say we'll put the ordinance together and teeth into it and we'll attack it that way first before we decide to go into something like this and take a big chance in doing something like this.

Chairman Roy stated Alderman just for my clarification...you said put the ordinance together...what type of ordinance...this is the basis of find a fair point and then charge the abusers...what type of ordinance?

Alderman Osborne stated we need some type of penalties for people that leave all this stuff out like you say and not following the rules...penalize the landlords that are abusing.

Chairman Roy stated again it has to start somewhere.

Alderman Osborne interjected it starts in the pocketbook. If you penalize them enough okay the abusers and if it's a \$1,000 fine for a couple of couches they're going to do the right thing...that's all I'm trying to say.

Chairman Roy stated I realize what you're trying to say but I'm trying to find...if they're not abusing anything. Right now, a landlord can empty out an apartment a day all year long and they're not abusing anything. We're trying to find that line where it becomes abuse and you can't write an ordinance that says if you put a couch on the curb 365 days-a-year it's abuse if this is not in place.

Alderman Osborne stated there are just so many tenants that move in and out anyway...I think we're going a little too far here. Like I said they pay big money out there for taxes...you know that you're in the real estate business.

Chairman Roy stated and taxes are based on the fair market value of properties. Landlords are receiving rent...

Alderman Osborne stated how much income and everything else...it all goes accordingly and this is the way they have to do it I guess.

Chairman Roy stated I'm trying to find...you've used the word create an ordinance and I'm trying to find what that balance is.

Alderman Osborne stated we can't do it here tonight, Sir, we're going to have to get together with the City Solicitor and go from there.

Alderman Forest moved to approve with the amendment to send this to the full Board. The amendment would be that I would ask Matt to come up with some information from the NET Team as to the amount of hours spent and the cost of implementing all of these complaints that we've had and come up with a figure so we know the cost of what it's costing us for their team versus what this is going to save us. At least come up with numbers and if Matt can understand where I'm going with this and Joanne also.



Deputy Clerk Normand stated you're looking for hours spent on trash related complaints that we receive.

Alderman Forest stated hours and cost and then maybe Joanne can come up with the numbers as to what we've saved or what we might save with this.

Chairman Roy called for a second to the motion. There was none.

Alderman Lopez stated that wasn't the total I was looking for.

Chairman Roy asked is there a possibly amendment Alderman Lopez?

Alderman Lopez stated I'd ask for the cost factors...quote of \$500,000...how you came about \$500,000 number one. Secondly, we have one person that's not here and third I would like to have a written from each of the representatives from the NET Team as to whether they support this ordinance.

Alderman Forest stated I believe the NET Team are individual employees or department heads that work from different departments unless we ask all of the department heads that are involved in this...there are several. Matt coordinates it but Police, Highway, Building are all involved in this NET Team and Matt can elaborate on how many departments are involved.

Alderman Lopez stated I understand that but anytime we've taken a drastic move in moving something like this...I'd like to have all of the answers...the Police Department, Building Department...I agree with you that there's people in place there but do they support this...that's what I want to know because I'm hearing without identities some people on the NET Team think that this is going to cost more and there's going to be more problems out there for the NET Team. If that's true then we should know that before we make the final decision and moving forward. I'm not debating the problem. The problem does exist...the question is that I think some Aldermen and others is it a savings that we provide for our taxes for the City of Manchester and the problems we have with 3-tenements or whatever the case may be on up...there's stuff out there and we've got to go and pick it up. Secondly, if we're going to continue to do that...if the NET Team's responsible departments are saying yes this is the best thing to do and weigh in on this I think that's important because without that and the other Alderman not being here I think it's important we have all the information.

Alderman Forest stated let me ask a couple of questions here before I either do what I've just done or change my mind. Matt and Joanne can the information that

Alderman Lopez wants get done for the next Aldermanic meeting and I don't seem to think that it can?

Deputy Clerk Normand stated Tuesday night...really what you're looking for is the department's dealing with NET dealing with the trash related items to have a response to this which are Building, Housing and Zoning...they're dealing with some trash related stuff. Health Department's obviously dealing with sanitation issues and then the Highway Department. I can probably get a response for you tomorrow from them.

Alderman Lopez stated that they support our charging all of these items.

Deputy Clerk Normand stated I'm not sure they would weigh in...it's more of a policy decision for this Committee...NET is going to respond to complaints regardless of whether customers are paying for the trash or not. If it means that the alleys are going to fill up with trash and their complaints come in we're going to respond to that...I'm not sure that those departments are going to weigh in on that and tell you yes it's a good idea, no it's not. I think I would defer to Joanne and I think they would defer to her as well as being the expert on this issue.

Chairman Roy stated Matt let me ask you this. Would it be possible for you to send a request to the impacted departments to have them review this and just give an impact statement...positive, negative, whatever their comment is. What impact they feel this would have on the City.

Deputy Clerk Normand stated sure.

Chairman Roy stated I think that satisfies...I don't want them to have to weigh in positive or have to weigh in negative. After four years of being on this Committee and with serving on the Special Committee I know what the response is going to be so I'm very comfortable in asking for each of the departments that have an impact in trash send a statement of what impact this would be on their respective departments.

Alderman Forest stated if the Chair accepts I will make that motion with the amendment that Alderman Lopez mentioned.

Alderman Osborne interjected discussion here.

Chairman Roy asked does that value your second.

Alderman Lopez asked is it going to come back to the Committee here?

Alderman Forest replied I want it to go to the full Board and we can debate it there.

Alderman Osborne stated no you don't want to do that.

Chairman Roy stated this is an item Gentlemen and I'm not going to belabor this all night...this has come up and come up and come up...we either need to move forward or kill it and this has been the recommendation of our trash professionals for almost 3.5 years...we either need to move forward or kill it and if it's going to get killed I'd prefer to see it killed at the full Board. So, if we get the information and the Board votes no as a policy then it goes away.

Alderman Osborne stated I don't mind all the amendments and all the questions. Mr. Lopez has questions...I still have more but we won't go on with it and Mr. Smith and so on but I think that this should be handled at the Committee level. I don't see any reason to push this up to the full Board...is there a time limit or something.

Alderman Forest interjected yes there is.

Alderman Osborne asked is there a timeline?

Chairman Roy stated to be honest with you, Alderman, yes there is.

Alderman Osborne stated it should be settled here.

Chairman Roy stated it has been settled here...this Committee has voted on it and put it to the full Board many times.

Alderman Lopez asked will the Chairman yield. I think we all want to do what we think is right. I think Alderman Osborne does have a point. What's going to happen is we're going to go to the full Board and there's going to be a big argument and everybody is going to say let's send it back to Committee...that happens all the time. The next Board meeting in kind of close, if we can solve this and have another Committee member with everybody and get these answers back here we still have a meeting coming up at the beginning of April to put this before the full Board...does that hurt anything as we move forward.

Alderman Osborne interjected it's been four years I don't know why.

Alderman Osborne moved to table.

Alderman Forest stated I have one more comment before you make that motion. I've resigned from this Committee once before because of what's going on right here today. This has been before this Committee off and on for the past four years...it keeps going to the full Board, it keeps getting sent back down to Committee, we have Aldermen that never attend these Committee meetings, we have Aldermen that always get back to the full Board...they don't follow through on it, they don't read the material...as far as the Committee level if this doesn't go again I will send in my resignation...it's going to be over...I'll do it at the full Board. I'm not wasting my time at Committee levels again. This happens in every committee that we're on. We keep sending it back to committee...it never gets done and that's it so we either vote on this motion or my resignation will be in tomorrow morning and that's the way I feel about this...it's been four years of my time.

Alderman Osborne asked are you talking to me, Sir?

Alderman Forest stated yes I am.

Chairman Roy interjected Gentlemen if I could I'm going to have Alderman Smith make a comment.

Alderman Smith stated I believe Matt...aren't you having a special meeting with the Mayor on Thursday.

Deputy Clerk Normand stated that's correct.

Alderman Smith stated I imagine all the other departments will be there. I know a couple of them...the Building Department and a couple of others are very responsive to different ideas that came up tonight before this Committee and I know the Committee's worked hard and it's too bad that we do get personalities involved but I'm looking out for my neighborhood which right now in all the City and like I say Alderman Osborne is correct you don't have the problems in Wards 1 and 2 that we have. We have multi-family homes and it's going to come out one way or the other and I just think this is a double tax and I'll call it quit now but I think the Committee worked hard and somebody shouldn't take it personally.

Chairman Roy stated Alderman Smith I see your concerns and I will honestly tell you that what I've learned about solid waste if we're going to attack blight issues in this City then we have to address issues like this that are not only a drain on our taxes and on our constituents and focus those revenues and reduce costs on improving the situation and that's why I bring this forward and that's why I offered to Chair this Committee. I understand Alderman Forest's sheer frustration

because back on November 16, 2004 the trash professionals that we hired that we pay hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars worked for months to come up with a program that would help us through these troubled times and now three years later we're unwilling to make a policy decision that affects only the abusers and I guarantee you years from now you'll look back at this and say we should have done that the first day it was suggested. But, we get stuck in this to full Board, back to Committee to get Joanne to write a better policy, to full Board and back to Committee. Gentlemen, it either moves forward or it dies and that's where we're left with and when you look at problems in this City every time we talk about blight and trash and problems and whether it's being handled by the NET Team if we're not willing to make tough policy decisions then we should not open our mouths at full Board meetings about what happens in our wards. The only impact this will have on Ward 1 is that the landlords that live in Ward 1 will pay for the problems they have in their buildings outside of Ward 1 and the other constituents that are not abusers of the program will reap the tax savings or see the tax base go up when wards with blight problems get improved. It either goes forward tonight or it dies, Gentlemen.

Alderman Lopez stated boy this is a hot issue...very passionate about something here. For people who have been waiting four years and don't want to wait two more weeks that doesn't make sense because you know when it goes to the full Board these questions are going to come up...show me the \$500,000 that you're saying we're going to save, show me how that is going to work. The NET Team...the question's going to come up...do the people on the NET Team agree with the direction we're going in for the City. So, I'm asking my colleagues let's just work together, let's get the answers...two weeks is not going to hurt anything after four years.

Chairman Roy stated I'm willing to accept a motion that requests anything of any department in order to gain the knowledge that whatever Aldermen need to move this forward. We have a meeting one week from tonight and Matt has said he has plenty of time to get an impact statement of this from every department and I would fully expect that Joanne and the professionals can dig through all the different times that this has come up and all the different votes that we can compile it and move forward.

Alderman Lopez stated I think we can move it forward to the second meeting in March and have another meeting and go over these items and questions that the full Board is going to have. If you want it to die at the full Board I think we're heading in that direction and I think that we need to have that information so that we can have that dialogue at Committee level. You can call a meeting right after next week and we can get all the information and then move it to the second

meeting in March if that's the case but at least we're going to have the answers for the full Board...you don't have all the answers. But, you've got to remember that there's...

Chairman Roy stated the next meeting in March is a week from tonight.

Alderman Lopez stated so the first meeting in April then...so, that's only a couple of weeks away. You know what the problem is you have 14 Aldermen and you've been here for four years...Alderman Forest has done a lot of good work on it but when the questions come up with the other people who haven't participated in coming to these meetings which is always the case. So, if we have the answers and we have the documentation or what we're going to send to the full Board as a package the question's going to come up...you know which Alderman is going to ask how do you come up with \$500,000. I'm asking my two colleagues let's get this information, bring it back to another Committee meeting and have it the first week of April...nothing is going to happen, the sky is not going to fall down. IF you accept that motion I'll put that in the form of a motion that we get the information, have another Committee meeting and answer all these questions before we go to the full Board so everybody's satisfied. You're dealing with 14 Aldermen.

Chairman Roy asked can the Clerk schedule a meeting for March 27<sup>th</sup>?

Deputy Clerk Normand replied I'll have to check the calendar but I'm sure we can get something together for that week.

Chairman Roy stated it's normally a week we wouldn't have meetings the fourth Tuesday so if that can be scheduled and I would ask that this be the only agenda item.

Alderman Smith stated a point of information unless it's changed we have an Accounts Committee meeting on the 27<sup>th</sup>...fourth Tuesday of the month...just so you know.

Chairman Roy stated I'd be happy to follow your meeting.

Alderman Osborne stated I made the motion to table item 3(a). Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Aldermen Forest duly recorded in opposition and Alderman O'Neil absent.

Chairman Roy stated I would ask all of my colleagues to refresh themselves over the amount of times this has come up to our full Board. We had very few changes in the last election so a number of us were there in 2004 and the professionals have recommended this for three years.

b) Program options relating to the NH CRT landfill ban effective  
July 1, 2007

Ms. McLaughlin stated item 3(b) is in reference to the CRT landfill ban that will take place in the State of New Hampshire July 1, 2007. That means that no video display device greater than four inches across will be allowed to be landfilled. What I have included is a number of options. I believe that probably taken together we would be able to keep up with the number of televisions and computer monitors that would be coming to us. We have had for the past three years an electronics program at the drop off anyway so we're well versed in how to run a program like this. We recently contracted with a company who's given us a very good deal on our electronics program and our recommendation would be that we allow electronics to be brought including the video monitors and televisions be brought to...the anticipation of revenue loss of about \$10,000 but we feel that that would keep the electronics out of the alleyways and would come to us at the drop off where we could get them demanufactured and recycled. We can also collect them at our two hazardous household waste days because people will be coming there anyway...again, no charge. I've included that there are private companies around that do allow residents or actually anybody to drop off computers and CRT's at their facilities, however, that is a fee based program. Additionally, I found out that Southern NH Planning has scheduled a number of events...six events over the course of the year but that would also be a pay per unit program. I'd like to mention at this point that there are take back programs available through Dell, Hewlett-Packard and Apple. Any questions at this point?

Alderman Lopez stated loss of revenue of \$10,000.

Ms. McLaughlin stated this time we're charging \$07.5/pound for any and all electronics that are brought to the drop off facility.

Alderman Lopez stated now you don't want to charge anything.

Ms. McLaughlin stated we feel that we would be able to sustain that...that would keep electronics as I said out of the alleyways and that will save us the cost of having to send special trucks around to pick them up because they can no longer

be collected in the packer trucks, which we have done in the past and generally we can't pick that up with the crane because that breaks the glass and the minute you break the glass it becomes a hazardous material.

Alderman Lopez stated so then the private company in Londonderry if we drop it off there it will cost \$10/computer, \$15/TV but you're not going to charge anything for that here.

Ms. McLaughlin stated that's correct. I'm just giving you what all the options are for people to dispose of these.

Alderman Lopez stated but for now you're just looking for authority to move forward for the drop off...no charge.

Ms. McLaughlin stated that's right.

Alderman Lopez stated that's a state law.

Ms. McLaughlin stated it's a landfill ban...they can no longer be landfilled. Below that I've included outreach/educational recommendations that we plan to go forward with in order to let people know that these items will now be banned from the landfill and they can no longer dispose of them with their trash.

Alderman Osborne asked what are we going to do with the elderly that have no transportation to take it there?

Ms. McLaughlin replied I haven't a plan for that...what do we do now when they have yard waste?

Alderman Osborne stated I guess now you throw it in the back of the truck but like you say you have to stop that due to state law whatever...but what's going happen like you say it's free drop off at wherever...what are the elderly who don't have transportation are you going to pick it up for them, they'll call you at Highway and they're going to pick it up for them...some people have no relatives, they have no way of getting this stuff to a drop off station.

Ms. McLaughlin stated I will look into a recommendation for that.

Chairman Roy stated Joanne I can answer that for you...much like the landlord that plays within the rules on the drop off and curbside pick up in our Bulky Waste Program there are contractors like RMG, like Pinard that will go out upon a phone call, charge a fee, come to a person's door...there are private companies RMG in



Londonderry that will allow residents to drop off their computers. There are companies that specialize in waste management that will pick up anything in your doorstep for a fee...they're private companies.

Alderman Osborne stated these elderly they don't have money...they can't be paying fees every time they want their television picked up or whatever.

Chairman Roy stated it's a state law. We didn't make it.

Alderman Osborne stated I understand that I'm just trying to make it a little easier for our residents in the City that's all. I understand the state statute, I know we have to do it but I'd like to see something done for the elderly as well.

Alderman Lopez stated I'm sure we can find something out there.

Alderman Osborne stated that's what I'm asking. I'm not trying to make it hard here I'm just trying to make it easy I think.

Chairman Roy asked Joanne does this need to go out to the residents...the ban goes into effect July 1<sup>st</sup> so if this was moved to the full Board for next week would that stay within your timeframe.

Ms. McLaughlin replied we won't be able to make the utility inserts and that was another attachment I had included the wordage...we'll have to do other than the utility inserts but that certainly will give us enough time.

Alderman Lopez moved to table the whole thing and move it one time if we're going to move everything out of Committee. I don't want to confuse when this gets out to the full Board and start getting into the other aspects until we have the whole thing. Unless you think it's necessary to go out.

Alderman Osborne asked what's the timeframe?

Alderman Lopez stated if the timeline's July is it going to give you enough time at the April meeting to do all these things.

Ms. McLaughlin stated yes with the exception of the utility inserts we'll be able to get this information out.

Alderman Osborne stated I'll have an answer on the elderly...what we're planning on doing when this takes effect.

Ms. McLaughlin stated I can investigate that for you.

Alderman Osborne duly seconded the motion to table item 3(b). There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Roy addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. Topics for discussion:

- a) NH house bills recommending a solid waste surcharge for all material that is landfilled or incinerated

Ms. McLaughlin stated there have been three bills in the State House this year that are recommending a solid waste surcharge. Two of those bills are pretty much redundant...two of those bills are looking for a \$1.00/ton surcharge for all trash that is either landfilled or incinerated in the state. The third bill is requesting a \$2.50 surcharge/ton that will be landfilled or incinerated. The purpose of the surcharge is to enhance the Waste Management Division program at the Department of Environmental Services and also that the bills have the intent of returning all of the monies to the municipalities in the form of grants...that would mean...last year we landfilled 48,000 tons of material that would be \$48,000. In order to get that money back we would have to write and apply for grants and any monies that we would receive must go to solid waste programs only and that's just an update for you.

Chairman Roy stated the \$48,000 if this passed would come out of taxpayer pockets. Would the Committee like to send a message to the full Board to oppose this bill.

Ms. McLaughlin stated we have testified at all three bills up at the Legislature and the Mayor has sent a letter in opposition to all of these.

Chairman Roy stated thank you.

Alderman Lopez asked has the full Board sent a letter.

Chairman Roy stated the full Board has not the Mayor's office has. The full Board needs direction from this Committee on solid waste matters.

Alderman Lopez moved to recommend opposition to the house bills and seek Board support.

Ms. McLaughlin stated what they did was to take all three bills and take them into Executive Committee and that's the last we've heard. We can oppose it as we have done at all three hearings.

Alderman Lopez asked can we still send it to the Board and send it to the committee in Concord.

Ms. McLaughlin stated we can still send that information if they're still considering them.

Alderman Lopez stated we have to get full Board approval though.

Alderman Osborne duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

b) Progress Report on the Recycling Program

c) Proposed Recycling Outreach Program

Ms. McLaughlin stated I do have a couple of other items that were requested at the last meeting...Alderman O'Neil asked about the linking of the web sites and I would let you know that that has happened. In the past Corcoran site was linking to ours but now ours also links to his. Another question posed by Aldermen Forest, O'Neil and Duval was regarding the School Department and their recycling programs. We have requested information...what we have received is that they do have a recycling program with Waste Management but we were never able to find out when the contract expires or if the schools were actually participating. So, that's all we've heard so far.

Chairman Roy stated I would ask this Committee to send to the full Board a request from the full Board to the School Department as to all of their solid waste items as we're about to look at the School budget and how that impacts the City side.

Alderman Osborne so moved to the Chairman's request. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Roy asked are there any other items, Gentlemen or Joanne.

Ms. McLaughlin stated I could turn it over to Patrick and have him talk about the plans for the Materials Recovery Facility as well as the Recycling Program.

Mr. Corcoran stated I've got plans and would be more than happy to show you layouts there. Actually, we're meeting with City Planning Tuesday the 20<sup>th</sup> at 2 PM to go over the details of the site. Once we have Planning and City officials' blessing it will be headed to NHDES for permit approval by the end of the month which is a two, two-and-a-half-month process. Once we have that in hand which will be should be the end of June, beginning of July in that zone and then we're allowed to start moving some dirt. The process is slow and tedious as you can imagine this is a big size project for my firm and this coming week we'll also be hiring a site engineer that will be keeping tabs on the project for my firm as well as the City on progress of a pretty good size incentive to get it on task and I'll go back to doing what I do best which is to move a lot of recyclables for a lot of towns. If you'd like to see what it looks like as far as the site we have preliminary drawings that are 85% ready to go to NHDES for site approval...I'd be more than happy to show those to you. As far as the Recycling Program...materials being picked up off your streets...the tonnage is still up which is good news because I thought that during February...

Ms. McLaughlin interjected we actually have a year's worth of data now and we've compared this 2006 data to the previous data...same annual timeframe and what we have seen is a 6.6% increase in the tonnage of fiber and a 13.3% increase in the tonnage of the co-mingled containers and I'm going to beat you to the punch, Alderman Roy, and tell you at \$65.00/ton if we'd thrown that extra material out that would have been at a cost of about \$22,000 to the City. So that's a cost diversion.

Alderman Lopez stated with spring coming up we ought to run the TV program again.

Ms. McLaughlin stated that's a good idea.

Chairman Roy asked would it be possible to forward that report with our report to the full Board for next week and if Patrick if you could have possibly a smaller version probably the finished product...I think you're final print of what the property will look like...maybe that could get included in our next week's agenda for all of the Aldermen to see some of the progress.

Alderman Lopez asked are you on schedule?

Mr. Corcoran replied yes. Due to the size of the building that we're going to be building for the City we had some constraints at your site due to flood plain and some other issues that we wanted to be very sensitive to so we ended up moving the site a little bit further which encroaches a little bit on your operation right now

so we had to redesign your operation right now which took four extra weeks. So, I'm about four weeks behind of where I was but in the next two weeks we should be caught up so I'm looking at really being on target.

Alderman Lopez stated it is a major step for the City so if you run into any particular problems make sure the Chairman knows so that if you can't solve them yourself...I'm sure you're capable of doing that but sometimes government gets in the way of progress.

Mr. Corcoran stated so far the relationship with the City has been fabulous on moving me in the right direction. This is an enormous project for Manchester and for my firm and for many communities that are looking at this project. Joanne and I have a presentation in front of 250 municipal officials April 5<sup>th</sup> and quite honestly we're gearing ourselves up now because we're going to have a lot of questions and a lot of folks that are very interested in what's happening. This will be a great dynamic change for your Solid Waste Program. I know Joanne and I are very excited about this project as you all have done a great job in getting it to this point...the next stage is actually building it...we're months away.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, on motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee